

**REMARKS**

This paper is responsive to the Office Action dated October 17, 2007 (the “Office Action”).

Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 16-19, 22, 26, 33, 34, 38-43, and 45-53 are pending.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 16-19, 22, 26, 33, 34, 38-43, and 45-53 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 16-19, 22, 26, 33, 34, 38-43, and 45-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,516 issued to Lee et al. (“Lee”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,425,123 issued to Rojas et al. (“Rojas”), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,416,903 issued to Malcolm (“Malcolm”).

The amendments add no new matter. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, in the Specification as originally filed on p. 9, among others. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable and respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending rejections and objections in view of the amendments and remarks presented herein.

***Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 16-19, 22, 26, 33, 34, 38-43, and 45-53 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Rojas and further in view of Malcolm. While not conceding that the cited references qualify as prior art, but instead to expedite prosecution, Applicant has chosen respectfully to address the rejections as follows. Applicant reserves the right, for example in a continuing application, to establish that the cited reference does not

qualify as prior art as to an invention embodiment previously, currently, or subsequently claimed.

Applicant's independent claims 1, 18, and 34 have been amended. Applicant respectfully submits that the amended claims include limitations that are not disclosed within the cited sections of the references. For example, amended independent claim 1 includes modifying the base version of the application in response to the internationalization and/or the localization of the base version of the application. This modifying provides, in some implementations of the invention, a closed-loop feedback between the base version development, internationalization, and localization of a software product, as depicted in FIG. 1 of the present application. This closed feedback can be made iterative, as depicted in FIG. 1, and as discussed in the Specification. The cited passages of the references do not teach such features. The cited passages could not and would not be understood by a person having ordinary skill in the art as teaching such closed feedback or iterative processing because they do not disclose the claimed modifying of a base version of the application in response to the internationalization and/or the localization of the base version of the application.

At least this limitation is absent from the cited passages of the references. At least for this reason, amended independent claim 1 and all claims dependent therefrom are allowable under § 103(a). At least for similar reasons, amended independent claims 18 and 34 and all claims dependent therefrom are also allowable under § 103(a).

In addition, Applicant's dependent claims 45 is additionally allowable over the cited passages. The Office Action points to a portion of Lee that teaches that concurrent builds on software releases can be performed "at any time" during a development cycle. (Lee at 3:56-64.) Applicant respectfully submits that this teaching does not disclose or fairly teach Applicant's

limitation that a localization of the first stage of the base version of the application is performed “concurrently with an internationalization of the second stage.” Just because a reference suggests operations at “any time” does not mean that the reference teaches that an operation is performed at a specific time, for example with the specific timing set forth in Applicant’s claim 45. The reasoning in the Office Action is specious: if it were logical, it would imply that a prior art reference that mentions the concept of “any thing” could be seen as disclosing any possible limitation of any future invention. This reasoning is clearly incorrect. Moreover, it is thoroughly inadequate to support a rejection under § 103(a). In particular, the argument in the Office Action does not support the contention that Lee’s builds at “any time” teach or fairly suggest Applicant’s localization “concurrently with an internationalization of the second stage.” At least this additional limitation is therefore also absent from the cited passages, rendering dependent claim 45 additionally allowable under § 103(a). Dependent claims 48 and 51 are similarly additionally allowable under § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5093.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. The undersigned also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission be charged to deposit account 502306.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450, on February 19, 2008.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Applicant

2/19/08  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Cyrus F. Bharucha  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 42,324  
Telephone: (512) 439-5097  
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099